

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 20-50 are pending in this application. Claims 1-19 are canceled. Claims 20-28 are amended by this response. Claims 29-50 are added by this response. Claims 24, 26, 29, 34 and 40 are independent claims

#### **No Change in Claim Scope or Substance**

Applicants wish to respectfully assert that the amendments made to independent claims 24 and 26 are made solely to correct issues of style and grammar, and are not meant to change the scope of these claims or otherwise add or delete substantive matter with respect to them.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

Claims 15-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that the claims are generally narrative and indefinite, and fail to conform with current U.S. practice. Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Of the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 in the Office Action, claims 15-19 have been canceled and claims 20-28 have been amended. The amendments to claims 20-28 resolve grammatical and stylistic issues. At least in view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 15-17 and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Number 2006/0109388 to Sanders et al. (hereafter "Sanders"). Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 24, Sanders teaches a vehicle mounting system for a display device where the display device is a video player unit that can be selectively mounted to

a housing panel. The housing panel is a member of a housing that is attached to a surface within a vehicle (Fig. 5). Sanders' housing panel is shown as permanently attached to the vehicle-mounted housing, with the video player unit capable of being attached to or detached from the housing panel (Figs. 7a-c).

In comparing Sanders' invention to independent claim 24, the video player unit of Sanders is analogous to the "cabinet having a display unit" from claim 24, and the housing of Sanders is analogous to the "supporting base to be combined with said cabinet, which is attached to a surface." Unlike Sanders, which only teaches mounting and de-mounting the video player unit to and from the vehicle-mounted housing, claim 24 further specifies "a second mounting and demounting mechanical unit for combining said cabinet and the display unit so that the display unit can be mounted to and demounted from said cabinet."

Sanders discloses the components of a video player unit (Fig. 17), but shows the unit as a single device not meant to function with the display portion (Fig. 17, 40) separated from the cabinet portion (Fig. 17, 54). Applicants respectfully submit that the requirement in claim 24 of not only allowing the cabinet to be mounted and demounted from the vehicle-mounted base, but of also allowing the display unit to "be mounted to and demounted from said cabinet" is not taught or suggested by Sanders.

Independent claim 26 recites the limitation of "a second mounting and demounting mechanical unit for combining said cabinet and either a display unit or a cartridge so that either the display unit or the cartridge can be mounted to and demounted from said cabinet." Applicants submit that this is nearly identical to the language of independent claim 24, and renders claim 26 patentable over Sanders for the same reasons as set forth above in connection with claim 24.

Independent claim 29 states that the mounting device comprises "an axial member disposed in said cabinet." Applicants submit that the portion identified as a "Mounting Demounting Unit with axial member" on page 4 of the Office Action is actually part of the housing plate, and therefore part of the housing, which is analogous to the supporting base of the

present invention. Sanders' depiction of a demounting operation of the video player unit from the housing plate (Figs. 7a-c) clearly shows that the portion identified in the Office Action as a "Mounting Demounting Unit with axial member" moves with respect to the video player unit, but not with respect to the housing plate, as the video player unit is demounted from the housing plate (Figs. 7a-c). This indicates that the identified element is a portion of the housing plate, and not a portion of the video display unit. Further, Sanders does not depict or discuss an analogous structure on the video player unit. Applicants respectfully submit that Sanders does not teach or suggest "an axial member disposed in said cabinet" as required by independent claim 29.

Independent claim 34 requires "retractable axial members disposed on inside surfaces of protruding portions of said cabinet." Applicants submit that because Sanders fails to teach any axial member disposed as a mounting unit on the video player unit (which is regarded as a combination of the cabinet and the display device taught in the present application), the presence of "retractable axial members disposed on inside surfaces of protruding portions of said cabinet" as required by independent claim 34 is also not taught by Sanders.

Independent claim 40 requires fitting holes for mounting a display device to a base that are "disposed on opposite, outward-facing ends of said base such that said holes are disposed along a straight line." Because Sanders' mounting base is shown as enclosing the video display unit (Fig. 5), Applicants submit that Sanders does not teach or suggest "disposed on opposite, outward-facing ends of said base" as required by independent claim 40.

With respect to all dependent claims in the present application, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 24, 26, 29, 34, and 40.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all the requirements and limitations of independent claims 24, 26, 29, 34, and 40, and all claims depending therefrom, are not taught or suggested by Sanders. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Takeuchi Rejection**

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of Japanese Patent Number 07-329648 to Takeuchi. Claim 18 has been canceled, rendering this rejection moot.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Chang Rejection**

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0113451 to Chang (hereafter “Chang”). Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claim, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Chang is relied upon to teach a plurality of cabinets and bases, and does not address the underlying deficiency of Sanders in failing to teach “an axial member disposed in said cabinet” as required by independent claim 29, from which claim 23 depends.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Chang nor Sanders, taken alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit), teaches or suggests all the features and limitations of claim 23. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

At least in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael K. Mutter (Reg. No. 29,680), at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant